



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

at heart" which contain the point of the comparison. Professor Wilamowitz misapprehending the reference of γάρ says that the meaning is that Ajax though unwilling did retire, for he knew that this was the right way to defend the ships for which he feared. That is quite impossible. There is no suggestion of any such strategy on the part of Ajax and it cannot be read into line 569.

πάντας δὲ προέεργε θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας ὁδεύειν

Which merely says that in his retreat and his rallies he tried to prevent the Trojans from making their way to the ships. He has been turned to flight against his will by Zeus (l. 544). There is no question as yet of actual fighting at the ships. The Trojans do not break through the wall till the end of the next book.

In the second passage the same simile is applied to Menelaus retiring unwillingly from the body of Patroclus xvii. 665-67

ὥς ἀπὸ Πατρόκλοιο βοῇν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος  
ἦε πόλλ' ἀέκων· περὶ γὰρ διέ μή μιν Ἀχαιοὶ  
ἀργαλέον πρὸ φόβοιο ἔλωρ δηϊοῖσι λίποιεν.

Here again γάρ refers to the point of the simile contained in τετιηότι θυμῷ used of the lion and πόλλ' ἀέκων, here its virtual equivalent, used of Menelaus. The only difference is that here πόλλ' ἀέκων is not reinforced by the repetition τετιημένος ἦτορ. Not perceiving this Professor Wilamowitz argues that it is only the constraint of the interpolated simile that prevents the poet from telling us with γάρ why in spite of his unwillingness Menelaus left his place. But we have already learned that from Ajax' request that Menelaus should find Antilochus and dispatch him to Achilles. His unwillingness and his exhortation to remember the gentle kindness of Patroclus are due to the fear that in his absence the Greeks will abandon the body to the Trojans.

The new scholasticism of the higher criticism seems to render its addicts blind both to the niceties of Homeric usage and to the reasonable implications of the context of the passages which it tortures on the rack of "analysis."

PAUL SHOREY

## TWO SOPHOCLEAN CRUXES

*Antigone* 4:

οὐδὲν γὰρ οὐτ' ἀλγεινὸν οὐτ' ἄτης ἄτερ  
οὐτ' αἰσχρὸν οὐτ' ἄτιμόν ἐσθ', ὅποιον οὐ  
τῶν σῶν τε κἄμῶν οὐκ ὅπωπ' ἐγὼ κακῶν.

That ἄτης ἄτερ, though read even before Didymus, is a corrupt reading, appears to admit of no argument. The passage, however, despite the numberless conjectures proposed, seems to be considered hopeless. No doubt

every ambitious scholar has tried his hand at it, and I hesitate to calculate how many suggestions I have myself made or entertained. Among them I have worked over the glosses of Hesychius: ΑΑΑΤΟΝ· τὸ ἀβλαβὲς καὶ εὐχερές, ἢ ἀνευ ἄτης, ἢ ἀπλήρωτον. ΑΑΤΟΝ· ἐπιβλαβές, ἢ ἀνευ ἄτης ἢ ἀπλήρωτον. ΑΑΤΟΣ (obviously ΑΑΤΟΣ)· χαλεπός, δυσχερής· ἀκόρεστος, ἀχόρταστος. For, assuming that Sophocles wrote ἀάατον, ἄτης ἄτερ might be taken as an explanatory gloss which had crept into the text. This suggestion, however alluring, I was led to abandon because of certain passages which seemed to me to offer a simpler and more satisfactory solution; for ἄτης was both intelligible and natural, and ἄτερ alone was unacceptable.

For the thought and the sequence of concepts one naturally compares: *Oed. Tyr.* 1283:

νῦν δὲ τῇδε θήμερα  
στεναγμός, ἄτη, θάνατος, αἰσχύνη, κακῶν  
ὅσ' ἔστι πάντων ὀνόματ', οὐδέν ἔστ' ἀπόν.

This passage, long noted by me as evidence for the soundness of the MS tradition as regards ἄτης, and affording a striking parallel to ἀλγεινόν, ἄτη, αἰσχρόν, ἄτιμον, suggests no remedy for ἄτερ. Two other passages, however, which I chanced to read the same day, gave the hint that has approved itself to my judgment for at least ten years, to wit:

Eurip. *Hec.* 714:

ἄρρητ' ἀωνόμαστα, θανμάτων πέρα,  
οὐχ ὅσι' οὐδ' ἀνεκτά

and Pausanias iv. 5. 6: αἱ δὲ γινώμει διάφοροι παρὰ πολὺ ἐγίνοντο, Ἀνδροκλέους μὲν ἐκδιδόμει Πολυχάρην ὡς ἀνόσια τε καὶ πέρα δεινῶν εἰργασμένον κτλ. For in these texts, in tenor not unlike the Sophoclean crux with which we are concerned, πέρα with a noun in the genitive is closely linked with one or more adjectives to form an impressive and emphatic whole. I assume, then, that Sophocles wrote ἄτης πέρα. But something remains to be said about the phrase. It is to be noted that besides the form just illustrated examples not a few occur in which πέρα is used adverbially, following an adjective and preceded by καί; as

Eurip. *Elect.* 1187: ἀλαστα μέλεα καὶ πέρα  
παθοῦσα σῶν τέκνων ὑπαί.

Soph. *fr.* 189 Pearson: ὦ πᾶν σὺ τολμήσασα καὶ πέρα γυνή.

Arist. *Thesmoph.* 705: ταῦτα δῆτ' οὐ δεῖνα πράγματ' ἔστι καὶ περαιτέρω;

Arist. *Av.* 418: ἄπιστα καὶ πέρα κλύειν.

Here the addition of καὶ πέρα has clearly the force of 'nay, more,' as is shown by the phrase δεινὸν καὶ πέρα δεινοῦ (*Demos.* 45, 73; cf. *Dionys. Halic. A.R.* 11. 39.) Nor can one doubt that θανμάτων πέρα and πέρα δεινῶν are shorthand for θανμάσια καὶ πέρα θανμάτων and δεινὰ καὶ πέρα δεινῶν: in

like manner ἄτης πέρα would be equivalent to ἀτηρὸν καὶ ἄτης πέρα. One might, then, render Sophocles thus, reading ἄτης πέρα,

There is no pain, nor confusion worse confounded,  
No scandal nor dishonor, yours and mine,  
But these my eyes have seen it all fulfilled.

Pearson, commenting on Soph. fr. 189, calls this 'a frigid hyperbole': be that as it may, it was obviously in rather common use, and Sophocles resorted elsewhere to hyperbolic statements not essentially different, as when he said

*Antig.* 1281:     τί δ'; ἔστιν αὖ κακίον ἢ κακῶν ἔτι;  
*Oed. Tyr.* 1365:  εἰ δέ τι πρεσβύτερον ἔτι κακοῦ κακόν,  
                    τοῦτ' ἔλαχ' Οἰδίπους.

These considerations led me to adopt the reading ἄτης πέρα, believing that ἄτερ was an early (and easily explained) corruption of πέρα. Finding the same conjecture credited to Wecklein, I took occasion to consult his *Ars Soph. Emendandi*, page 79, only to discover that he offered nothing to commend it but the statement, "Corruptum autem ἄτερ propter ἄτης ex πέρα. Cum verbis οὐδὲν γὰρ . . . ἄτης πέρα cf. locutionem δεινὸν καὶ πέρα δεινόν."

*Oed. Tyr.* 44:     ὥς τοῖσιν ἐμπειροῖσι καὶ τὰς συμφορὰς  
                    ζώσας ὁρῶ μάλιστα τῶν βουλευμάτων.

Here again, as the presumably old scholium shows, the MS tradition goes back to ancient sources. Though the passage is not so obviously corrupt as that which we have just considered, because a tolerable sense may be extracted from it by dint of the sort of violence of faith which the Kingdom of Heaven suffereth. The critical reader who peruses the scholium or the tortuous brief for the defense written by Jebb may well remain unconvinced. Only too plainly these advocates are making the best of a bad case. Jebb renders: "for I see that, when men have been proved in deeds past, the issues of their counsels, too, most often have effect." To take τῶν βουλευμάτων with τὰς συμφορὰς is difficult; to understand τὰς συμφορὰς as "issues" is in the context next to impossible. Moreover, the meaning which has been given and must be given to ζώσας, if retained, is, though possible, not quite what the situation demands. With a sure instinct, various scholars have pitched upon ζώσας as the seat of the difficulty, requiring a substantive in its stead. One cannot doubt that if a satisfactory emendation had been offered, it would have been accepted in spite of all that has been said, or might be said, in favor of the traditional text. Musgrave suggested δμώας or θήσας; Mekler, ῥίζας. Apart from other obvious objections, these would-be substitutes for ζώσας are alike unsatisfactory, because they depart too widely from the reading of the MSS.

I would propose ζώσ<τρ>ας. The word ζώστρα does not occur in the lexica; but ζώστρον does. Moreover, Sophocles (*fr.* 342 Pearson) used ἐπιζώστρα, and ἀναζώστρα, διαζώστρα and περιζώστρα were employed by other Greek writers. "To gird one's self" for a fray or for a journey must have been a common thought with the Greeks, since it was the common practice, except that in athletic contests the διάζωμα was in later times omitted. The fact that the expression does not, apparently, occur in classical Greek in a metaphorical application can under the circumstances signify nothing. In later Greek we find ζώνη τροπικῶς ἢ δύναμις, ἐπειδὴ ὁ ἐζωσμένος εὐσταπέστερός ἐστι πρὸς τὴν πρᾶξιν (Theodoret in *Psalms*. apud Suidam), and one cannot doubt that so obvious a figure must have been long familiar. One has only to think of the metaphorical uses of συντείνω and its occasional connection with ζώνη, as e.g. in Eurip. *Iph. Taur.* 203 sq., where the Moirai, as birth-goddesses, are clearly functional equivalents of Athena ζώστειρα or ζώστηρία, to make sure that the thought was familiar to the Greeks of the fifth century. Plato could make Socrates bid the scatter-brained Euthyphro ἐντενεῖ σαντόν (*Euth.* 12A); and what was more natural than to bid a man to brace himself when about to be put to the test in a trial of waist of strength? For the situation one may compare Terence *Phorm.* 315 sq., where at the crisis the parasite says to himself,

Ad te summa solum, Phormio, rerum redit:  
tute hoc intristi: tibi omnest exedendum: accingere.

He is not proposing to brace himself for a physical encounter with the irate father, but trying to collect his wits and use them to the best purpose. One would wish to know just what stood here in the Greek original of Apollodorus: not knowing, it is useless perhaps to speculate. But it will suffice to draw the parallel. As Phormio exhorts himself to brace up and bethink himself of some expedient in the difficult situation that confronts him, we may well conceive of the priest of Zeus as politely suggesting the same course to Oedipus,

To men approved, I find, e'en dire disaster  
Doth chiefly serve to brace their wits for counsel.

For necessity is the mother of invention.

The quotation from Theodoret suggests another possibility. Supposing the corruption in ζώσας to date, as it may, from the fifth (or early fourth) century, it may be worth considering whether Sophocles did not write ζώνας rather than ζώστας; for early Attic inscriptions (cf. Roberts, *Introd. to Gr. Epigr.*, pp. 384 sq.) show forms of sigma and nu distinguished solely by the slant of the nu. For the sigma compare the βόστρουχος εἰλιγμένος of Eurip. *fr.* 382. 7. The corruption is therefore not difficult to explain. The interpretation would be the same whether we read ζώνας or ζώστας.

W. A. HEIDEL